

upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Henderson, Griffin, Roper, Bayer, Gibson, Gordon-Hagerty, Fahey, and Ayres nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 663.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Melissa F. Burnison, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs).

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Burnison nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Tennessee.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware is somewhere in the neighborhood, and he has a train to catch in a few minutes. So I ask unanimous consent that after I make a few remarks about today's events and the voting today, the Senator from Delaware be recognized, and that fol-

lowing his speaking, I be recognized again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today the Senate voted on immigration.

Immigration is a passionate issue. It affects the lives of people. It affects the American creed, which involves the rule of law, which involves the fact that we are a nation of immigrants. It goes to the heart of our country, and we have very strong opinions about it. All of us know that.

Of course, that is the reason we have a U.S. Senate. This is not an issue that the Shreveport City Council or the Nashville Metro Council can solve. We can't solve the problem of our Nation's borders. We can't solve the problem in our communities about what to do about people who were brought here as children illegally through no fault of their own. That is our job. That is the job of the President of the United States. That is the job of the Senate, and it is the job of the Congress.

We tried before. We tried in 2007, and we failed. We tried in 2013, and this body passed a bill with 68 or 69 votes. I voted for it. If we had passed that bill, as for all the issues we debated today, we wouldn't have them anymore because we dealt then with border security in 2013. We would have added 20,000 border agents, 700 miles of fencing, biometric detection at our ports of exit and entry, and E-Verify for all of the employers in the country. We would have dealt with the issue of legal status for people illegally here, people overstaying their visas, temporary workers. We would have done all of that in 2013, but we did not do it.

So we are left with this problem of a large number of people living in this country—some for a long period of time—who were brought here as children through no fault of their own, which is one problem. We have another problem on the border, which is that the border isn't secure. People coming across the border is one problem, but in my view, the drugs coming across the border are the biggest problem. We have had a lot of hearings in the HELP Committee about opioid addiction. A lot of the heroin and a lot of the illegal drugs that are devastating our communities are coming across our southern border. It is just a fact, and we need to deal with it.

So we are dealing with and we voted today on what to do about the children brought here illegally by their parents through no fault of their own and what to do about border security. The President of the United States did his job on this one.

He did what a President is supposed to do.

I read a book by George Reedy, who was Lyndon Johnson's Press Secretary. He said that a President's job—the

Senator from Delaware is a former Governor, so he knows about this. He and I had an executive job when we were Governors. I did my job this way as Governor. A President's job is to see an urgent need, to develop a strategy to meet the need, and to persuade at least half the people you are right. That is what George Reedy said the President's job was, and I think President Trump in this case has done his job. He saw an urgent need. He saw a need of the Dreamers, the DACA people who are here. He saw an urgent need to deal with the border. He saw an urgent need to deal with some other holes in our system of legal immigration. He saw a need to deal with the fact that we have kind of slipped into a situation where the million people a year who come here legally, unlike most countries in the world, are brought here by cousins just because they are cousins. They are not brought here because they are part of the immediate family or because they add something special to our country, either skilled or unskilled, and he sought to change that.

The President recognized the fact that once we give someone legal status in this country, once we say to them: We have decided we want you to be here permanently or nearly permanently. We want you at least one day to dream of becoming a citizen of the United States—I agree with the President on that. I don't want millions of people living in this country permanently who are pledging their allegiance to Afghanistan and Russia and China and Japan and every other country in the world; I want them to stand up in the Federal court or wherever they have the naturalization ceremony—or to be able to dream of standing there—and take the same oath of allegiance to this country that George Washington's soldiers took at Valley Forge, which is the same allegiance today that it was then, where you renounce your allegiance to any other country and you pledge your allegiance to the United States. I want anyone who we have decided deserves legal status on a permanent basis to have that in the back of their mind, not the pledge of allegiance to Korea or Afghanistan or Bangladesh or Chile or any other country in the world.

I think the President did his job. He made a reasonable proposal. I think he did something that most Democrats and many Americans—maybe many Republicans—did not expect him to do. He said: Let's take care permanently of these 1.8 million children who were brought here through no fault of their own. As long as they don't get in trouble and follow the law, are law-abiding, let's give them the dream of citizenship after 10 or 12 years. Let's deal with merit-based immigration. Let's make some changes in our legal system. Let's plug some of the holes in the border so these drugs don't come in.

The President made a very strong proposal. Now we are doing what we are supposed to do. We are supposed to

react to that. Well, we did today. Senator GRASSLEY offered the President's proposal, and it got 39 votes. A bipartisan group offered a narrower version of what the President wanted, and it only included the border security part—\$25 billion—and a permanent fix for the DACA or Dreamers, who are here because of that provision in the law. It got 54 votes. But neither got 60. Neither got to 60, which we need.

Why do we need 60 votes? Because we are the U.S. Senate. The House of Representatives only needs a majority. We get 60 because we want a consensus. Why do we need a consensus? When we take on a big, difficult, passionate issue like this, we want the people of this country to accept it. We want them to turn around and look—well, if that many Democrats and that many Republicans thought it was a good idea, then maybe I should rethink my own view and think it is a good idea.

That is why President Trump has a chance to be Nixon to China on the immigration issue. He won his election to a large extent because he promised a wall and he talked about immigration. Now he is saying: Here is a solution that has to do with border security, citizenship, and the DACA children, and people will pay attention to that. And they will pay attention to us if we get more than a bare majority to vote for some version of what the President has recommended. Well, we are up to 54.

I can give you an example of what I just said. In the late 1960s, the debate was civil rights. Everett Dirksen was the minority leader of the Senate; he was the Republican leader. Lyndon Johnson was the President; he was a Democratic President. They worked together to get 68 votes for the civil rights bill of 1968. It was opposed by Senator Richard Russell of Georgia, but when Senator Russell lost, he flew back to Atlanta and said: It is the law, and we should follow it.

That is what we did with civil rights. That is what we did with Social Security. That is what we did with Medicare. That is what we did more recently with fixing No Child Left Behind. That is what we did with 21st Century Cures. When we take on a tough, complicated issue and we talk about it long enough and we get enough of us on both sides of the aisle to agree on it, we get a consensus, the country accepts it, and you don't have to worry about the next Congress coming in and passing it, repealing it, and changing it.

When we don't do that, it is like ObamaCare. It passes with a partisan vote, and then we have a permanent political battle trying to repeal it or replace it. That has been going on for 8 years. We are still not through it yet. We hope to be, but we are not through it yet.

So we need 60 votes for a solution for the DACA children who were brought here and the border security position. Actually, I would suggest our goal

should be 70, not 60. We are not going to get there with a situation that has 47 or 48 Democrats and 8 or 9 Republicans—that doesn't make 60 in the public schools of Tennessee—and we won't get it with almost all the Republicans and just a few Democrats. That is not a majority. That is not a consensus. That is not going to persuade the people of this country that we have come up with something lasting that most people can accept. I have no doubt we can get there.

There were 36 Senators of both parties who came to a meeting 3 weeks ago at which we said to our two whips—Senators DURBIN and CORNYN, on each side—we would like for the two of you to help us find a consensus on this. There were 36 of us. There have been 20 or 25 meetings—about equal number in both parties—trying to find some solution here. I think we are making some pretty good progress. We just didn't get there today.

I am glad the majority leader said that this is not the end of it. It can't be the end of it. We can't just leave this here. I can't go back to Tennessee and tell Memphis or Nashville or Knoxville: Sorry, we can't do it, so the mayor or the city council will now decide what to do about these children who are illegally here and about the drugs coming across the southern border and about legal immigration. I can't do that.

I need to say: I am going to go back. The President has done his job. The Senate worked on it for a week. We got up to 54 votes. We need 70. We need 70.

So my hope is that the President will continue to advocate; do his job; see an urgent need—he did; recommend a strategy to deal with the need—he did; and try to persuade at least half the people he is right. He is a good persuader. And then we will do our job, and that is not to stand in the corners and throw things at each other. Let's see where we can agree and do what we did on civil rights and fixing No Child Left Behind. This is not any harder than those issues. We ought to be able to do it; otherwise, we shouldn't be here.

I tell my colleagues often that it is pretty hard to be a Senator. It is hard to get here. It is hard to stay here. And while you are here, you might as well amount to something, and amounting to something means getting a result. We didn't get a result today, but I am convinced that we can.

In conclusion—and then I will go to my friend from Delaware—how do we get to 70? Well, I came up here years ago and worked for a Senator named Howard Baker. He was very successful in this body. He ended up as the majority leader. He stood right over there next to Senator Byrd when he was the Democratic leader. They had great differences of opinion, but they ran this body very well. Howard Baker had a saying. He said that it helped to be an eloquent listener, and he said that you have to remember that sometimes the other fellow might be right.

I would like to say to my Democratic friends that in this case the other fellow might be named Trump. They might not like that. They may not like it, but I think we should give the President credit for seeing an urgent need, recommending a strategy, and doing his best to persuade half of the Americans that he is right about that.

I think we need some Members on the other side to do what eight of us on the Republican side did this day, which is move the other direction, recognize that the other fellow might be right, come to a conclusion, and do our job. I think we made a start this week, but we are not there yet. I look forward to the opportunity to finish the job, and remembering Howard Baker's advice that the other fellow might be right might be a good way to start.

Mr. President, I yield the floor to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I am grateful to my colleague from Tennessee for yielding to me.

One of the reasons Howard Baker was one of the great leaders in this place is he had good staff, and one of those folks, who was maybe the senior member of his staff to those many years ago, was LAMAR ALEXANDER, now Senator ALEXANDER. Howard Baker would be very proud of the kind of Senator he has become—a great Governor, Secretary of Education. He is someone who speaks, more often than not, with great wisdom. He and I agree on not everything but pretty much everything.

I am mister glass half full. My wife says to me that I need to be more of a realist. She says I am too much of an optimist. I am not an optimist today. I feel like we leave here—get on a train, go home—feeling like we have not done our job.

The Senator from Tennessee has said that the President did his job, but I just don't agree. I just don't agree. He served as Governor; I served as Governor. If we had an impasse on a difficult issue in Delaware—we are lucky; we are a small state—we can pull people together to resolve just about anything and figure out what we call the four c's. One of those is close to Delaware. No. 1 is communicate. No. 2 is compromise. No. 3 is collaborate. No. 4 is civility. Those are the four c's. That is the reason why we had some success in our State.

I am not sure we really demonstrated enough of those today. I am not sure the President did as much as he could have done and should have done. We have a Bible study that meets here on Thursdays, as the Senator from Tennessee knows. Seven or eight of us that need the most help meet with the Chaplain of the Senate, Barry Black, retired rear admiral and chief of chaplains for the Navy and Marine Corps.

Today in our Bible study, he mentioned the golden rules: Treat people the way we want to be treated. Love

thy neighbor as thyself. And ask the question: Who is our neighbor? He told the parable about the Good Samaritan. Oftentimes, he mentioned Matthew 25, which deals with the least of these. When I was hungry, did you feed me? When I was naked, did you clothe me? When I was thirsty, did you give me a drink? When I was sick and in prison, did you visit me? When I was a stranger in your land, did you welcome me?

I think there is a moral imperative here. In the case where young people were brought here when they were very young from another country by their parents, have grown up here, were educated here, and are working here in all kinds of jobs—jobs that need to be filled—to say by our actions today that sometime in March—maybe March 5—a lot of them will be facing the prospect of being rounded up and sent back to where they were born, I think, there is a moral imperative that says that is not right.

In Delaware State University, we have any number of Dreamers who are students there. They are the most impressive young people I have met in my life. They are smart. They work hard. They are good students. They are going to go off and be great employees. They are going to start businesses of their own. For us to say that there is a good chance that you will be sent back to where you were born, doesn't make a whole lot of sense to me. I think it is morally wrong.

I think it is also economically wrong. Today, a bunch of folks in the landscaping business came to see me. They wanted to talk about the problems they have getting people to come to work for their firms, to work for their companies, and to do landscaping work. It is not easy work. It is hard to find people to do it. In many cases, the folks that will do it come day after day—a day's work for a day's pay. They are people who have come here from other countries. The landscapers today—I don't know if they are Democrats or Republicans—are frustrated because they have a good business and customers need their work to be done, and they have a hard time getting Americans born and raised here to do the work.

Earlier this week, on Monday, I was in Georgetown, DE. We raise more chickens in Sussex County, DE, than anywhere in America. There are 400 chickens for every person who lives in my State. Poultry is a big business. We met with folks from the Delmarva Peninsula who are very much involved in the poultry industry. They said basically the same thing we heard today from the landscapers: We have a hard time finding people who will work in poultry plants. We have done a lot of things we can to enhance the pay and the benefits. We have wellness centers. We provide incentives for people who want to improve themselves, go on, and have a chance to move up the ladder of success.

But there was one lady who said that she is from a major poultry company. I

think it was Perdue. She said: We are trying to fill positions. We have 100 people who offer to come in for an interview. She said that out of the 100, they actually have 20 that reach the second step because they can pass the blood test and meet other challenges they have, or obstacles, in order to reach the next rung on the ladder for an interview. They start with 100 and are down to 20 almost like that. Out of those 20, she said, eventually 5 will be able to pass the drug test and have the work experience and the willingness to work. She said they end up with five to hire. Out of those five they hire, a number of them stop coming to work a month later. She said that is what they face; that is reality. And then she said: Please help us. In fact, all the poultry industry people we met on Monday said: Please help us with this.

As it turns out, it is not just landscaping businesses that need people to work. It is not just food processors—poultry in this case. When we received the monthly jobs report earlier this month for the month of January, we were told that the unemployment rate is about 4.1 percent—steady where it was. We are still under way with the longest running economic expansion. I think we are past 8 years now. When people went to work today, there were about 2 to 3 million jobs that were not filled. When folks went to work in this country today across America, for about 2 to 3 million jobs, nobody showed up to do the job. It makes no sense to me that we face the prospect of 700,000, 800,000 people who were raised here, were educated here, work here, want to work here, and want to contribute, could do those jobs, and they may not get a chance to do them.

Employers have risen up with one voice, from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Business Roundtable, the National Federation of Independent Businesses, and the Farm Bureau—you name it—to say: We have a problem on the human resources side with getting people to come to work.

I think it is economic insanity for us to say that for 700,000 or 800,000 people and maybe a couple hundred thousand people that came here from El Salvador: We are going to send you home.

It makes no sense.

I hope my friend is right. I hope we leave here, come back in a week or so, and say: How do we get to an agreement?

The last thing I will say is this. Border security is really important. I was chairman of the Homeland Security Committee for a while. I am still the senior Democrat on the committee. If you compare border security in this country today to what it was 10, 20 years ago, it is a more secure border. It should be. We spent a fortune. We have 20,000 people down in border security. We are doing a lot of smarter things.

I will conclude with this point. Included in the proposal today that, I think, got the most votes—54 votes—

was the Collins, King, et al. Included in that package were a number of what I call force multipliers. They would actually make the border more secure. There is someplace along the border where a wall makes sense, like in San Diego. I was stationed in the Navy in San Diego. There are some places there, and there are other places where a wall makes sense. I heard more than a few times: If you build a 15-foot wall, someone will come along with an 18-foot ladder, or come along with a tunnel to go under it.

There are a lot of things we can do to assist the 20,000 Border Patrol men and women we have. We are having a hard time filling those 20,000 positions. We have hundreds of those jobs vacant today.

Do you know where we could put people to work on the border? At ports of entry, where hundreds of millions of dollars of commerce are coming through every week—coming up from Mexico and going down into Mexico. There is a crying need for 3,000 people to work as Customs officers at the ports of entry.

My colleague talks, as he should, about concern about drugs coming into our country. Right now, the biggest threat is from China. They are coming over here ordered by the internet. There is stuff coming in by the mail service. Senator PORTMAN and I are working to do a much tighter job in that regard to stop the importation of fentanyl through the Postal Service.

There are a bunch of things that we can do on the border that were included in the bipartisan proposal today. I will mention a couple of them. It is not just enough to have drones. You have to have drones that you can fly. You have to have good surveillance systems. You have to have people who maintain them. And they don't just fly 8 hours out of every 24. They are able to be up in the sky throughout the day and throughout the week with the kind of surveillance systems that are needed.

It is not just enough to have a couple of helicopters that can fly every day, but they have to be able to go 24/7 and have the same kind of surveillance systems that are good. With fixed-wing aircraft, the same is true. I was a naval flight officer of a P-3 air mission command. We did a lot of surface surveillance and chased submarines all over the world. They would send us out in the ocean to look for somebody's ship that had sunken or a sailboat that had sunken. Sometimes all we would have in the middle of the ocean was a pair of binoculars—good luck finding anybody.

We don't have to just use binoculars on the border, with drones, fixed-wing aircraft, helicopters, fixed-wing towers, or mobile towers. We have surveillance systems that can enable us to see 15, 20, 25 miles into Mexico. We should use them and make sure they are maintained and that people are trained to operate them.

When you have hundreds of miles of river, building a wall there doesn't

make sense. Boats do and boat ramps make sense. In places where the wall may not make sense, a fence may make sense. Roads along the fence may make sense. In some places, Border Patrol on horses makes sense. In some places, we have high grasses. Put a Border Patrol officer up on a horse and he can see for miles and miles. That makes sense.

This and more was included in the proposal that drew 54 votes. It is the kind of thing we ought to do. It doesn't cost \$25 billion, but it will be cost-effective and make our border more secure.

I have great affection for our colleague from Tennessee. I appreciate his encouraging tone that this is not the end. What did Churchill say when he got bounced out of office at end of World War II? He was asked 6 months after the war, when he really carried Britain through on his back. The war is over. He gets beaten. He is asked by a reporter after he lost: For you, Mr. Churchill, is this the end?

He said: It is not the end. It is not the beginning of the end. It is the end of the beginning.

I hope this is the end of the beginning—maybe with the help of God and maybe with a little bit better leadership from the folks down at 1600.

The last thing is this. The Department of Homeland Security—which I worked for years to strengthen, to make something we can all be proud of—apparently has put out a statement today. I asked to read it. I am told by all kinds of people that it is riddled with inaccuracies and falsehoods. I am going to read it tonight on the way going home. I hope that is not true. What we need to operate here is the truth.

I will close with the words of Thomas Jefferson: If the people know the truth, we will not make a mistake. I heard that what the Department of Homeland Security put out today was not truthful. It is hard, with that kind of information, to do the right thing.

I wish to thank my colleague for giving me this much time and for being so patient with me. We will be back here in 10 days or so, and we will have a chance to reconnect and see if we can pull a victory out of the jaws of defeat.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Delaware for his remarks and his comments. I certainly hope that when we come back, we can get a result. That is what the job is about. I cosponsored and voted for the President's legislation. I cosponsored and voted for the bipartisan legislation. My hope is that I have a chance to cosponsor and vote for legislation that gets 65 or 70 votes and solves the problem.

THANKING THE JUNIOR SENATOR FROM ALABAMA

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I would like to note the presence on the

floor of the junior Senator from Alabama, Mr. JONES, who has been waiting patiently. He and I were working together on something that I am about to speak about, a resolution that has to do with an event that happened 50 years ago, the Memphis sanitation workers strike.

He has plenty to say about it, but he has not yet made what we call his maiden speech on the Senate floor. We usually reserve that moment for a singular opportunity to speak. So he is waiting until that time to speak. I respect that. I told him the little story of what happened to Senator Baker when he was in Senator JONES' position. Baker's father-in-law, Senator Dirksen, whom I mentioned, was the leader. Everybody assembled to hear Baker's maiden speech. Baker spoke a little too long. Dirksen came over to congratulate him. Baker looked up and said to his father-in-law, Senator Dirksen: How did I do?

Dirksen said: Howard, perhaps you should occasionally enjoy the luxury of an unexpressed thought.

So I congratulate Senator JONES on his sticking with tradition here. I value the fact that we are working together on civil rights, as well as the fact that we will be in Memphis together on the Civil Rights Pilgrimage, which he is taking a part in leading early next month. I thank him for being on the floor today while I make these remarks.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MEMPHIS SANITATION WORKERS STRIKE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, 1968 was a tumultuous year. Violent protests erupted in cities across the country. Both Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and then-Senator and Presidential candidate Robert F. Kennedy were assassinated, and American soldiers were fighting in the Vietnam war.

In Memphis, TN, African-American sanitation workers had faced years of hazardous working conditions and discrimination in pay and benefits. Their strike would become a historic event in the civil rights movement.

In January 1968, the workers began negotiating with Memphis Mayor Henry Loeb and the Memphis City Council to improve pay and working conditions.

On February 1, 1968, two sanitation workers, Echol Cole and Robert Walker, sought shelter from the pouring rain and were crushed to death in their garbage truck when the compactor on the truck malfunctioned. Their deaths galvanized the 1,300 African-American sanitation workers who decided to begin their strike to protest working conditions on February 12, 1968.

The workers demanded recognition of their union, increased pay, and safer working conditions. Mayor Loeb and the city council responded by threatening to replace the striking workers unless they returned to work.

Throughout February and early March, negotiations continued, and on March 28, 1968, Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Rev. James Lawson led a march from the Clayborn Temple that ended with rioting, arrests, and the death of 16-year-old Larry Payne. Civil rights leaders vowed to march again, focusing on the principles of non-violence.

On April 3, 1968, Dr. King addressed a rally of 10,000 African-American workers and residents, members of the clergy, and union members at the Mason Temple—the Memphis headquarters of the Church of God in Christ. His speech included these lines:

I have been to the mountain top. . . I've seen the Promised Land. I may not get there with you. But I want you to know tonight that we, as a people, will get to the Promised Land.

That was Dr. Martin Luther King.

The next day, April 4, 1968, Dr. King was assassinated as he stood on a balcony at the Lorraine Motel.

On April 8, 1968, 4 days later, 42,000 people marched in Memphis. The strike was resolved on April 16. The 1,300 sanitation workers in Memphis took a stand for freedom, and they displayed courage in their pursuit of equality.

In his speech on April 3, Dr. King said:

Now we're going to march again, and we've got to march again, in order to put the issue where it is supposed to be—and force everybody to see that there are 1,300 of God's children here suffering, sometimes going hungry, going through dark and dreary nights wondering how this thing is going to come out. That's the issue. And we've got to say to the nation: We know how it's coming out. For when people get caught up with that which is right and they are willing to sacrifice for it, there is no stopping point short of victory.

Now, 50 years later, this resolution that I, Senator JONES, Senator CARDIN, and Senator CORKER submitted seeks to recognize their sacrifice and contributions to the civil rights movement.

It is important that our children grow up learning about how these 1,300 Memphis sanitation workers and many others struggled for racial justice in the midst of all that chaos. That is why, on Tuesday, I submitted the Senate resolution to which I referred. I did it, along with U.S. Senator BOB CORKER, my colleague from Tennessee; Senator DOUG JONES from Alabama; and Senator BEN CARDIN from Maryland, to recognize the 50th anniversary of the 1968 Memphis sanitation workers strike.

Representative STEVE COHEN has submitted the same resolution in the U.S. House of Representatives. He recruited 76 cosponsors.

I would like to thank Representative COHEN for taking the lead in the House. I would like to thank my Tennessee colleagues, Representatives BLACK, BLACKBURN, COOPER, DESJARLAIS, DUNCAN, FLEISCHMANN, KUSTOFF, and ROE for their support as well.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this resolution.